



ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.

607 14th Street, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20005

Telephone (202) 783-6040
Facsimile (202) 783-6031
www.rfem.com
info@rfem.com

April 25, 2014

Honorable Alison J. Nathan
United States District Judge
Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse
40 Foley Square, Room 906
New York, New York 10007

E. Anthony Figg
Harry F. Manbeck, Jr.
George R. Reppe
Steven Lieberman
Joseph A. Hynds
Martin M. Zoltick
R. Danny Huntington
Richard Wydeven
Sharon L. Davis
Robert B. Murray
Jeffrey L. Ihnen
Martha Cassidy, Ph.D.
Brian S. Rosenbloom
Jason M. Shapiro
Brian A. Tollefson
C. Nichole Gifford
Joo Mee Kim
R. Elizabeth Brenner-Leifer
Nancy J. Linck, Ph.D.
Sharon E. Crane, Ph.D.

*Not a member of the D.C.
Bar. Practice limited to patent,
trademark and copyright matters
and cases in federal courts.

G. Franklin Rothwell
(1928-2011)

Lisa N. Phillips
Steven P. Weihrauch
Robert P. Parker
Jenny L. Colgate
Leo M. Loughlin
Monica Chin Kitts
Matthew D. Stephens
Michael V. Battaglia
Seth E. Cockrum, Ph.D.
Michael H. Jones
Rachel M. Echols
Brett A. Postal
Erik K. Sivertson*
Chen Li
Jeffrey R. Fougere
Jennifer P. Nock
Jennifer B. Maisel*
Soumya P. Panda*
Jason M. Nolan, Ph.D.*
Aydin H. Harston, Ph.D.*
Joanna M. Grigas*

Of Counsel
William N. Hughet

Re: *Braintree Laboratories, Inc. v. Breckenridge Pharmaceutical, Inc.*
Case No.: 12-cv-6851-AJN

Dear Judge Nathan:

We represent Defendant Breckenridge Pharmaceutical, Inc. (“Breckenridge”), the successor in interest of Cypress Pharmaceutical, Inc., in the above-referenced action. (See D.I. 62.) We submit this joint letter on behalf of Plaintiff Braintree Laboratories, Inc. (“Braintree”) and Breckenridge to request a two (2) business day extension of time for the parties to “submit a letter indicating whether further action in this matter is warranted” pursuant to this Court’s January 17, 2014 order (D.I. 65), in view of the April 22, 2014 decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in *Braintree Laboratories, Inc. v. Novel Laboratories, Inc.*, No. 13-1348 (the “Novel Case”). The proposed new due date is April 29, 2014.

We understand that Rule 1.D of your Individual Practices requires that “requests for adjournment or extension of time must be made at least 48 hours prior to the scheduled deadline.” However, given that the Order set a three day time period for the submission of the letter, the parties did not realize they would require an extension until the 48 hour time period had passed.

Pursuant to Rule 1.D of your Individual Practices, Breckenridge provides the following information:

- (1) the original due date: **April 25, 2014**
- (2) the number of previous requests for adjournment or extension: **None**
- (3) whether these previous requests were granted or denied: **N/A**
- (4) whether the adversary consents: **Yes**

ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.

Honorable Alison J. Nathan
April 25, 2014
Page 2

Respectfully submitted,



Steven Lieberman

cc: All counsel of record

ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.

Honorable Alison J. Nathan

April 25, 2014

Page 3

SO ORDERED:

Dated: April ____, 2014

Honorable Alison J. Nathan
Judge, United States District Court
for the Southern District of New York

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on April 25, 2014, a true and correct copy of the foregoing **LETTER FROM STEVEN LIEBERMAN TO JUDGE NATHAN** was filed through the Court's Electronic Filing System (ECF), and was served electronically to the registered participants as identified on the Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF).

/s/ Erik van Leeuwen
Erik van Leeuwen
Litigation Operations Manager
Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck, P.C.